II. Claims 1-8, drawn to DNA encoding a phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ (SEQ ID NO:4), a vector comprising said DNA and a host cell comprising thereof, classified in class 435, subclass 252.3.

III. Claims 1-8, drawn to DNA encoding a phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ (SEQ ID NO:5), a vector comprising said DNA and a host cell comprising thereof, classified in class 435, subclass 252.3.

IV. Claims 1-8, drawn to DNA encoding a phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ (SEQ ID NO:6), a vector comprising said DNA and a host cell comprising thereof, classified in class 435, subclass 252.3.

V. Claim 9, drawn to an antisense of the DNA of SEQ NO:2, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

VI. Claim 9, drawn to an antisense of the DNA of SEQ NO:3, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

VII. Claims 10-14, drawn to a phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ of SEQ ID NO:1, classified in class 435, subclass 198.

VIII. Claim 10-14, drawn to a phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ of SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 435, subclass 198.

IX. Claim 15, drawn to an antibody of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$, classified in class 530, subclass 387.9.

X. Claims 16-19, drawn to a method for treating inflammation in a patient with an antisense of SEQ ID NO:3, classified in class 424, subclass 94.5.

XI. Claims 16-19, drawn to a method for treating inflammation in a patient with an antisense of SEQ ID NO:4, classifiedi n class 424, subclass 94.5.

XII. Claims 20-23, drawn to a method for increasing fatty acid utilization in a patient with SEQ ID NO:1, classified in class 424, subclass 94.5.

XIII. Claims 20-23, drawn to a method for increasing fatty acid utilization in a patient with SEQ ID NO:2, classified in class 424, subclass 94.5.

XIV. Claim 24, drawn to a method for measuring the activity of a phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$, classified in class 435, subclass 18.

XV. Claims 25-30 and 37, drawn to a method for identifying substance with modulate ipLA$_{2\gamma}$, classified in class 435, subclass 7.2.

XVI. Claims 31-36, drawn to a genetically engineered cell capable of identifying substance with modulate ipLA$_{2\gamma}$ expression in a cell, classified in class 435, subclass 325.

The Examiner noted that applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Election/Restrictions I-IV and VII-VIII: Claims 1-8 are in Class 435, Subclass 252.3. Moreover, Claims 16-23 would be searched in Class 424, Subclass 94.5. Note that while invention I purports to describe only SEQ ID NO:3, it necessarily must include SEQ ID Nos. 1-6 since these are included in Claims 1-8. Additionally, Claims 10-14 and 24-36 would be searched in Class 435. These classifications emphasize the high degree of relatedness of the described sequences. Sequences 1-6 in fact are not separate unrelated molecules, but they are all attributes of one molecule, the phospholipase A$_{2\gamma}$. The patent relates to phospholipase A$_{2\gamma}$ which is differentially spliced and translated. Thus, it is necessary to include all the sequences within a single patent. The product of differential splicing from one genomic sequence share extensive sequence identity, function specificities, and utilities with other sequences. The proteins are the translated products from these differentially spliced sequences and are all phospholipase A$_{2\gamma}$ proteins with extensive sequence identity, function, substrate specificity and utility. All sequence regions shared between nucleotide or amino acid sequences have 100% sequence identity.

Election Restrictions V and VI: The antisense sequence is not a unique manifestation of phospholipase A$_{2\gamma}$ sequence since DNA is composed of sense and antisense strands in cells, the antisense (reverse complement) is necessarily a feature of the same molecule.

Election restriction IX: The antibody was produced to phospholipase A$_{2\gamma}$ and its application was done to characterize the unique features of phospholipase A$_{2\gamma}$ in this patent application. The structure of the antibody is complementary to the structure of the protein and specifically derived from and dependent on the specific structure of the protein.

Moreover, it does not cross-react with various proteins and exhibits an extremely high degree of specificity for phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$.

Election restrictions X-XIII: Central to the claim of uniqueness of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ in the patent is its proposed unique function in cells. Thus, Claims 16-19 focus on functional therapeutic attributes of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ using either phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ protein or nucleic acid sequence and, as such, are a necessary part of the characterization of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$.

Election restriction XIV: The assay method is not a separate invention since it is integral to the description and characterization of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ in this patent application.

Election restriction XV: Assays for characterization of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ modulation in cells are integral to a description of this unique molecule. As such, it is part of the description of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$.

Election restriction XVI: Characterization of promoter and regulatory regions of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ are part of the description of this molecule in this patent application with regard to its modulation and functional role in the cell. As such, this is an integral part of the characterization and description of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$.

Election restrictions X-XVI are all methods of characterization of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$ and, as such, are not materially different methods employing different products. The effects and utilities of these methods are all directly related to characterization of phospholipase $A_{2\gamma}$.

Provisional Election: For completeness of response, Group I, claims 1-8, are provisionally elected. Group I includes Claims 1-8 which describe SEQ ID No. 1 through 6.

The Examiner's restriction requirement and election of species requirement are respectfully traversed in their entirety because, as applicants' argument shows, the species set forth in the Office Action are related. It is believed that a thorough search and examination of the claims would be relevant to the examination of all. In addition, requirements for election of species are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. § 121. No undue searching burden has been asserted by the Examiner and none is believed to result as a result of searching all claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the election of species requirement is requested. Kindly examine all claims at this time including Claims 1-8 of Group I.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all the claims in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Gordon F Sieckmann
Reg. No. 28,667
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63012
(314) 621-5070